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#### Interpretation: affirmative debaters must delineate what intellectual property they reduce in the 1AC.

#### Four types of IP that are vastly different.

Ackerman 17 [Peter; Founder & CEO, Innovation Asset Group, Inc; “The 4 Main Types of Intellectual Property and Related Costs,” Decipher; 1/6/17; <https://www.innovation-asset.com/blog/the-4-main-types-of-intellectual-property-and-related-costs>] Justin

Intellectual property protection isn’t as simple as declaring ownership of a particular product or asset. In most countries, there are four primary types of intellectual property (IP) that can be legally protected: patents, trademarks, copyrights, and trade secrets. Each has their own attributes, requirements and costs.

Before narrowing your focus on which form of protection to use, know that these forms of protection are not mutually exclusive. Depending on what you’re doing, you might be able to use a “belt & suspenders” approach and apply multiple forms of protection, or one approach might be the most sensible. Read the descriptions below to get some of the basics.

Used to protect inventive ideas or processes – things that are new, useful and nonobvious - patents are what most often come to mind when thinking of IP protection. **Patents** are also used to protect newly engineered plant species or strains, as well.

Procedure For most companies, patents result from the following stages: Conceptualization Typically, innovation teams work to address a common problem facing their organization, industry, or the world at large when developing their idea. When they’ve arrived at a solution or concept, they’ll draw up plans and gather the resources necessary to make it a reality. Prototypes or drawings can be created to provide a more accurate description of the end product or process. Invention Disclosure An internal review process often occurs with every invention. The innovation team consists of internal counsel and an invention review panel of varying disciplines. The reviewers assess, rate, rank, score, and highlight potential flaws in the supporting documents and descriptions for the invention, which are then addressed by the inventor. These reviews can and often do take place multiple times for a single invention. Patent Application If the invention is deemed meritorious enough for the pursuit of patent protection, some organizations prepare their own provisional or nonprovisional patent applications. Others will farm this stage out. There may be more tweaks as an application is prepared, and then submission to the appropriate patent office and the prosecution stage begins (the back & forth with the government patent office). Typically it is outside counsel that manages this process and related docketing activities. Docketing is the overarching name for activities that include management of paperwork and meeting filing deadlines specified by the government patent office. Because the application process is often very complicated, patent offices highly recommend working with experienced patent attorneys to handle this process. Maintenance Once a patent is approved, it has a finite lifetime. Patent holders are responsible for maintaining and tracking the usage of their patents and paying the appropriate periodic government renewal fees. If a given technology or other patented asset is collecting dust, you might not want to renew it. Instead, you can try and sell, license or donate it. Conversely, if a patented asset is performing well through product sales or licensing activities and its life is getting shorter, you might think about innovating ahead and maintaining competitive momentum. Costs Costs will vary depending on the country or countries where you file an application, and can run into tens of thousands of dollars depending on the invention’s complexity, plus attorney fees. Maintenance fees over the lifetime of the patent can run into thousands more per patent, per country where patent rights have been granted. You have to keep your eyes on these costs.

Trademark

A trademark is unlike a patent in that it protects words, phrases, symbols, sounds, smells and color schemes. Trademarks are often considered assets that describe or otherwise identify the source of underlying products or services that a company provides, such as the MGM lion roar, the Home Depot orange color scheme, the Intel Inside logo, and so on.

Procedure Trademarks do not necessarily require government approval to be in effect; they can apply through abundant use in interstate commerce. Still, registration of a trademark affords far superior protection and is gained by filing an application with the proper government office. A trademark application requires the company or user to provide a clear description and representation of the mark and its uses in conjunction with associated products or services. As with patents, it’s a good idea to partner with outside counsel that specializes in trademark applications and/or search services so they can help ensure there is a clear path for your desired mark. Costs Trademarks are generally quite less expensive to obtain. According to the US Patent and Trademark Office, trademark registration currently costs between $225 and $325 for each class code you use per mark. Attorney and search fees are extra. There are also periodic (and relatively inexpensive) government maintenance fees for trademarks.

Copyrights do not protect ideas, but rather the manner in which ideas are expressed (“original works of authorship”) - written works, art, music, architectural drawings, or even programming code for software (most evident nowadays in video game entertainment). With certain exceptions, copyrights allow the owner of the protected materials to control reproduction, performance, new versioning or adaptations, public performance and distribution of the works. Procedure Copyrights in general attach when the original works become fixed in a tangible medium, but should be registered with the government copyright office for optimal protection in the form of damages, injunctions and confiscation. Copyright registration applications are much simpler than patents or trademarks, and typically can be obtained by the author alone. The US Copyright Office encourages use of their online application system, and requires a sample of the work to be protected and some background information about the author. Costs Depending on the type of work being protected, currently fees vary between $25-$100 in the US. The most frequent copyright registration sought is for one work by one author, and costs about $35.

Trade Secret

Trade secrets are proprietary procedures, systems, devices, formulas, strategies or other information that is confidential and exclusive to the company using them. They act as competitive advantages for the business. Procedure There actually isn’t a federally-regulated registration process for trade secrets. Instead, the onus is on the company in possession of the secret to take necessary precautions to maintain it as such. This is an ongoing, proactive process and can include clearly marking relevant documents as “Confidential,” implementing physical and data security measures, keeping logs of visitors and restricting access. The issuance of nondisclosure agreements or other documented assurances of secrecy can also be employed. One of the first defenses typically put up when you assert that someone misappropriated your trade secret is that you failed to adequately treat it as a trade secret. Costs Though there are no official registration costs, there are costs associated with taking appropriate precautions and security measures. You must weigh the competitive significance of your secrets against the cost of protecting them.

#### Violation:

#### Negate:

#### 1] Shiftiness- they can redefine what intellectual properties the 1ac defends in the 1ar which decks strategy and allows them to wriggle out of negative positions which strips the neg of specific IP DAs, IP PICs, and case answers. They will always win on specificity weighing.

#### CX can’t resolve this and is bad because A] Not flowed B] Skews 6 min of prep C] They can lie and no way to check D] Debaters can be shady.

#### 2] Real World- policy makers will always specify what the object of change is. That outweighs since debate has no value without portable application. It also means zero solvency since the WTO, absent spec, can circumvent aff’s policy since they can say they didn’t know what was affected.

#### This spec shell isn’t regressive- it literally determines what the affirmative implements and who it affects
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Graphical user interface, application, table

Description automatically generated

#### A. Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all previously read positions before the debate on their NDCA wiki page under their own name with full citations, tags, and first three/last three words.

#### B. Violation: You didn’t – just said SEE OS

#### C. Standards::

#### 1] Pre-round prep: prep becomes atrocious when you make people sift through 20 word docs to figure out which links you’re reading and which impacts to prep. Discourages tricks—you can just hide a bunch of blippy arguments. Also key for inclusion since disadvantaged people have computers more prone to lag and even 3 or 4 can crash the program for them—outweighs accessibility is a multiplier for their impacts. Disclosing in cite boxes solves—people can quickly get a summary of your position and go to open source if they need more information

#### 2] wiki rules—the wiki tells you to disclose like everyone else. Freeloading is bad and o/w—it cultivates passive citizenship and turns any hope of actually solving their impacts which is a voter for education.
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#### Fairness is a voter—debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation and ow other voters on irriversibilty. Drop the debater—the abuse has already occurred and my time allocation has shifted—also the shell indicts your whole aff—justifies severance which skews my strat. Use competing interps—leads to a race to the top since we figure out the best possible norm and avoids judge intervention since there’s a clear briteline. No RVIs—

#### a. Baiting—they’ll just bait theory and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse and results in a chilling effect

#### b. its not logical—you don’t reward them for meeting the burden of being fair. Logic is a meta constraint on all args because it definitionally determines whether an argument is valid
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#### Permissibility and presumption negate – [a] the resolution indicates the aff has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation [b] Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false.

#### The aff burden is to prove that the resolutional statement is logical, and the reciprocal neg burden is to prove that the resolutional statement is illogical.

#### Prefer:

#### 1. Text – Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

[https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought //](https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought%20//)Massa

#### Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### 2. Debatability – a) my interp means debates focus on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years b) Moral oughts cannot guide action.

**Gray,** Grey, JW. "The Is/Ought Gap: How Do We Get "Ought" from "Is?"" *Ethical Realism*. N.p., 19 July 2011. Web. 28 Oct. 2015. //Massa

**The is/ought gap is a problem in moral philosophy where what is the case and what ought to be the case seem quite different, and it presents itself as the following question** to David Hume: **How do we *know* what morally ought to be the case from what is the case?** Hume posed the question in A Treatise of Human Nature Book III Part I Section I: In **every system of morality**, which I have hitherto met with, I have always remark’d that the author proceeds for some time in the ordinary way of reasoning, and establishes the being of a God, or makes observations concerning human affairs, when of a sudden I am surpriz’d to find, that instead of the usual copulations of propositions, is and is not, I meet with no proposition that is not connected with an ought, or an ought not. This change **is imperceptible**; but is, however, of the last consequence. **For as this ought**, or ought not, **expresses some new relation** or affirmation, ‘tis necessary that it shou’d be observ’d and explain’d; and at the same time that a reason shou’d be given, **for what seems altogether inconceivable**, how this new relation can be a deduction from others, which are entirely different from it. It is here that Hume points out that **philosophers argue about** various **nonmoral facts, then somehow conclude what ought to be the case** (or what people ought to do) **based on** those facts (about **what is the case**). **For example, we might find out that arsenic is poisonous and conclude that we ought not consume it. But we need to know how nonmoral facts can lead to moral conclusions. These two things seem unrelated. The is/ought gap [isn’t]** doesn’t seem like **a problem for nonmoral oughts**—what we ought to do to accomplish our goals, fulfill our desires, or maintain our commitments. For example, we could say, “If you want to be healthy, you ought not consume arsenic.” However, it might be morally wrong to consume arsenic. If it is, we have some more explaining to do.

#### 4. Neg definition choice – The aff should have defined ought in the 1ac as their value, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition.

#### Negate:

#### [1] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and it isn’t logically going to happen.

#### [2] In order to say I want to fix x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the problem exist to solve, which makes any moral attempt inherently immoral.

#### [3] member means “a body part or organ” (Marriam Webster) but a nation cannot have bodily organs so the resolutions incoherent

#### [4] Property means “a building” (Oxford Languages) so reducing intellectual buildings is incoherent

## 4

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing.

#### 1] Actor spec—governments must use util because they don’t have intentions and are constantly dealing with tradeoffs—outweighs since different agents have different obligations—takes out calc indicts since they are empirically denied.

#### 2] Death is bad and outweighs – a] agents can’t act if they fear for their bodily security which constrains every ethical theory, b] it destroys the subject itself – kills any ability to achieve value in ethics since life is a prerequisite which means it’s a side constraint since we can’t reach the end goal of ethics without life

#### 3] Pleasure and pain are the starting point for moral reasoning—they’re our most baseline desires and the only things that explain the intrinsic value of objects or actions

Moen 16, Ole Martin (PhD, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo). "An Argument for Hedonism." Journal of Value Inquiry 50.2 (2016): 267.

Let us start by observing, empirically, that **a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value** and disvalue **is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable**. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels**, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” **are** here **understood inclusively**, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative. 2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store**, I might ask: “What for**?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. **The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good**. 3 As Aristotle observes: “**We never ask** [a man] **what** his **end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself**.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that **if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad**. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that **pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value**. Although **pleasure and pain thus seem to be good candidates for intrinsic value and disvalue**, several objections have been raised against this suggestion: (1) that pleasure and pain have instrumental but not intrinsic value/disvalue; (2) that pleasure and pain gain their value/disvalue derivatively, in virtue of satisfying/frustrating our desires; (3) that there is a subset of pleasures that are not intrinsically valuable (so-called “evil pleasures”) and a subset of pains that are not intrinsically disvaluable (so-called “noble pains”), and (4) that pain asymbolia, masochism, and practices such as wiggling a loose tooth render it implausible that pain is intrinsically disvaluable. I shall argue that these objections fail. Though it is, of course, an open question whether other objections to P1 might be more successful, I shall assume that if (1)–(4) fail, we are justified in believing that P1 is true itself a paragon of freedom—there will always be some agents able to interfere substantially with one’s choices. The effective level of protection one enjoys, and hence one’s actual degree of freedom, will vary according to multiple factors: how powerful one is, how powerful individuals in one’s vicinity are, how frequent police patrols are, and so on. Now, we saw above that what makes a slave unfree on Pettit’s view is the fact that his master has the power to interfere arbitrarily with his choices; in other words, what makes the slave unfree is the power relation that obtains between his master and him. The difﬁculty is that, in light of the facts I just mentioned, there is no reason to think that this power relation will be unique. A similar relation could obtain between the master and someone other than the slave: absent perfect state control, the master may very well have enough power to interfere in the lives of countless individuals. Yet it would be wrong to infer that these individuals lack freedom in the way the slave does; if they lack anything, it seems to be security. A problematic power relation can also obtain between the slave and someone other than the master, since there may be citizens who are more powerful than the master and who can therefore interfere with the slave’s choices at their discretion. Once again, it would be wrong to infer that these individuals make the slave unfree in the same way that the master does. Something appears to be missing from Pettit’s view. If I live in a particularly nasty part of town, then it may turn out that, when all the relevant factors are taken into account, I am just as vulnerable to outside interference as are the slaves in the royal palace, yet it does not follow that our conditions are equivalent from the point of view of freedom. As a matter of fact, we may be equally vulnerable to outside interference, but as a matter of right, our standings could not be more different. I have legal recourse against anyone who interferes with my freedom; the recourse may not be very effective—presumably it is not, if my overall vulnerability to outside interference is comparable to that of a slave— but I still have full legal standing.68 By contrast, the slave lacks legal recourse against the interventions of one speciﬁc individual: his master. It is that fact, on a Kantian view—a fact about the legal relation in which a slave stands to his master—that sets slaves apart from freemen. The point may appear trivial, but it does get something right: whereas one cannot identify a power relation that obtains uniquely between a slave and his master, the legal relation between them is undeniably unique. A master’s right to interfere with respect to his slave does not extend to freemen, regardless of how vulnerable they might be as a matter of fact, and citizens other than the master do not have the right to order the slave around, regardless of how powerful they might be. This suggests that Kant is correct in thinking that the ideal of freedom is essentially linked to a person’s having full legal standing. More speciﬁcally, he is correct in holding that the importance of rights is not exhausted by their contribution to the level of protection that an individual enjoys, as it must be on an instrumental view like Pettit’s. Although it does matter that rights be enforced with reasonable effectiveness, the sheer fact that one has adequate legal rights is essential to one’s standing as a free citizen. In this respect, Kant stays faithful to the idea that freedom is primarily a matter of standing—a standing that the freeman has and that the slave lacks. Pettit himself frequently insists on the idea, but he fails to do it justice when he claims that freedom is simply a matter of being adequately (and reliably) shielded against the strength of others. As Kant recognizes, the standing of a free citizen is a more complex matter than that. One could perhaps worry that the idea of legal standing is something of a red herring here—that it must ultimately be reducible to a complex network of power relations and, hence, that the position I attribute to Kant differs only nominally from Pettit’s. That seems to me doubtful. Viewing legal standing as essential to freedom makes sense only if our conception of the former includes conceptions of what constitutes a fully adequate scheme of legal rights, appropriate legal recourse, justiﬁed punishment, and so on. Only if one believes that these notions all boil down to power relations will Kant’s position appear similar to Pettit’s. On any other view—and certainly that includes most views recently defended by philosophers—the notion of legal standing will outstrip the power relations that ground Pettit’s theory.

#### 4] Extinction outweighs

MacAskill 14 [William, Oxford Philosopher and youngest tenured philosopher in the world, Normative Uncertainty, 2014]

The human race might go extinct from a number of causes: asteroids, supervolcanoes, runaway climate change, pandemics, nuclear war, and the development and use of dangerous new technologies such as synthetic biology, all pose risks (even if very small) to the continued survival of the human race.184 And different moral views give opposing answers to question of whether this would be a good or a bad thing. It might seem obvious that human extinction would be a very bad thing, both because of the loss of potential future lives, and because of the loss of the scientific and artistic progress that we would make in the future. But the issue is at least unclear. The continuation of the human race would be a mixed bag: inevitably, it would involve both upsides and downsides. And if one regards it as much more important to avoid bad things happening than to promote good things happening then one could plausibly regard human extinction as a good thing.For example, one might regard the prevention of bads as being in general more important that the promotion of goods, as defended historically by G. E. Moore,185 and more recently by Thomas Hurka.186 One could weight the prevention of suffering as being much more important that the promotion of happiness. Or one could weight the prevention of objective bads, such as war and genocide, as being much more important than the promotion of objective goods, such as scientific and artistic progress. If the human race continues its future will inevitably involve suffering as well as happiness, and objective bads as well as objective goods. So, if one weights the bads sufficiently heavily against the goods, or if one is sufficiently pessimistic about humanity’s ability to achieve good outcomes, then one will regard human extinction as a good thing.187 However, even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be a good thing, we still have strong reason to prevent near-term human extinction. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an extremely high stakes moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the The future, given that we don’t go extinct any time soon, would be 2×10^14. So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction. Second, human extinction is by its nature an irreversible scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date. Third, we should expect ourselves to progress, morally, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have. Given these three factors, it would be better to prevent the near-term extinction of the human race, even if we thought that the extinction of the human race would actually be a very good thing. To make this concrete, I’ll give the following simple but illustrative model. Suppose that we have 0.8 credence that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 0.2 certain that it’s a good thing to produce new people; and the degree to which it is good to produce new people, if it is good, is the same as the degree to which it is bad to produce new people, if it is bad. That is, I’m supposing, for simplicity, that we know that one new life has one unit of value; we just don’t know whether that unit is positive or negative. And let’s use our estimate of 2×10^14 people who would exist in the future, if we avoid near-term human extinction. Given our stipulated credences, the expected benefit of letting the human race go extinct now would be (.8-.2)×(2×10^14) = 1.2×(10^14). Suppose that, if we let the human race continue and did research for 300 years, we would know for certain whether or not additional people are of positive or negative value. If so, then with the credences above we should think it 80% likely that we will find out that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 20% likely that we will find out that it’s a good thing to produce new people. So there’s an 80% chance of a loss of 3×(10^10) (because of the delay of letting the human race go extinct), the expected value of which is 2.4×(10^10). But there’s also a 20% chance of a gain of 2×(10^14), the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, the cost of waiting for a few hundred years is vanishingly small compared with the benefit of keeping one’s options open while one gains new information.
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#### Pharma innovation high now – monetary incentive is the biggest factor.

**Swagel 21** Phillip L. Swagel, Director of the Congressional budget office 4-xx-2021, "Research and Development in the Pharmaceutical Industry," Congressional Budget Office, <https://www.cbo.goc/publication/57126#_idTextAnchor020> SJ//DA

**Every year, the U.S. pharmaceutical industry develops a variety of new drugs that provide valuable medical benefits. Many of those drugs are expensive and contribute to rising health care costs for the private sector and the federal government. Policymakers have considered policies that would lower drug prices and reduce federal drug expenditures. Such policies would probably reduce the industry’s incentive to develop new drugs.** In this report, the Congressional Budget Office assesses trends in spending for drug research and development (R&D) and the introduction of new drugs. CBO also examines factors that determine how much drug companies spend on R&D: expected global revenues from a new drug; cost to develop a new drug; and federal policies that affect the demand for drug therapies, the supply of new drugs, or both. What Are Recent Trends in Pharmaceutical R&D and New Drug Approvals? T**he pharmaceutical industry devoted $83 billion to R&D expenditures in 2019. Those expenditures covered a variety of activities, including discovering and testing new drugs, developing incremental innovations such as product extensions, and clinical testing for safety-monitoring or marketing purposes. That amount is about 10 times what the industry spent per year in the 1980s, after adjusting for the effects of inflation.** The share of revenues that drug companies devote to R&D has also grown: **On average, pharmaceutical companies spent about one-quarter of their revenues (net of expenses and buyer rebates) on R&D expenses** in 2019, which is **almost twice as large a share of revenues as they spent in 2000.** That revenue share is larger than that for other knowledge-based industries, such as semiconductors, technology hardware, and software. The number of new drugs approved each year has also grown over the past decade. On averace, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved 38 new drugs per year from 2010 through 2019 (with a peak of 59 in 2018), which is 60 percent more than the yearly average over the previous decade. **Many of the drugs that have been approved in recent years are “specialty drugs.” Specialty drugs generally treat chronic, complex, or rare conditions, and they may also require special handling or monitoring of patients**. Many specialty drugs are biologics (large-molecule drugs based on living cell lines), **which are costly to develop, hard to imitate, and frequently have high prices.** Previously, most drugs were small-molecule drugs based on chemical compounds. Even while they were under patent, those drugs had lower prices than recent specialty drugs have. Information about the kinds of drugs in current clinical trials indicates that much of the industry’s innovative activity is focused on specialty drugs that would provide new cancer therapies and treatments for nervous-system disorders, such as Alzheimer’s disease and Parkinson’s disease. **What Factors Influence Spending for R&D?** Drug companies’ R&D spending decisions depend on three main factors: Anticipated lifetime global revenues from a new drug, **Expected costs to develop a new drug**, and Policies and programs that influence the supply of and demand for prescription drugs. Various considerations inform companies’ expectations about a drug’s revenue stream, including the anticipated prices it could command in different markets around the world and the expected global sales volume at those prices (given the number of people who might use the drug). The prices and sales volumes of existing drugs provide information about consumers’ and insurance plans’ willingness to pay for drug treatments. Importantly, when drug companies set the prices of a new drug, they do so to maximize future revenues net of manufacturing and distribution costs. A drug’s sunk R&D costs—that is, the costs already incurred in developing that drug—do not influence its price. **Developing new drugs is a costly and uncertain process, and many potential drugs never make it to market. Only about 12 percent of drugs entering clinical trials are ultimately approved for introduction by the FDA. In recent studies, estimates of the average R&D cost per new drug range from less than $1 billion to more than $2 billion per drug**. Those estimates include the costs of both laboratory research and clinical trials of successful new drugs as well as expenditures on drugs that do not make it past the laboratory-development stage, that enter clinical trials but fail in those trials or are withdrawn by the drugmaker for business reasons, or that are not approved by the FDA. Those estimates also include the company’s capital costs—the value of other forgone investments—incurred during the R&D process. Such costs can make up a substantial share of the average total cost of developing a new drug. The development process often takes a decade or more, and during that time the company does not receive a financial return on its investment in developing that drug. The federal government affects R&D decisions in three ways. First, it increases demand for prescription drugs, which encourages new drug development, by fully or partially subsidizing the purchase of prescription drugs through a variety of federal programs (including Medicare and Medicaid) and by providing tax preferences for employment-based health insurance. Second, the federal government increases the supply of new drugs. It funds basic biomedical research that provides a scientific foundation for the development of new drugs by private industry. Additionally, tax credits—both those available to all types of companies and those available to drug companies for developing treatmentscof uncommon diseases—provide incentives to invest in R&D. Similarly, deductions for R&D investment can be used to reduce tax liabilities immediately rather than over the life of that investment. Finally, the patent system and certain statutory provisions that delay FDA approval of generic drugs provide pharmaceutical companies with a period of market exclusivity, when competition is legally restricted. During that time, they can maintain higher prices on a patented product than they otherwise could, which makes new drugs more profitable and thereby increases drug companies’ incentives to invest in R&D. Third, some federal policies affect the number of new drugs by influencing both demand and supply. For example, federal recommendations for specific vaccines increase the demand for those vaccines and provide an incentive for drug companies to develop new ones. Additionally, federal regulatory policies that influence returns on drug R&D can bring about increases or decreases in both the supply of and demand for new drugs. Trends in R&D Spending and New Drug Development Private spending on pharmaceutical R&D and the approval of new drugs have both increased markedly in recent years, resuming a decades-long trend that was interrupted in 2008 as generic versions of some top-selling drugs became available and as the 2007–2009 recession occurred. **In particular, spending on drug R&D increased by nearly 50 percent between 2015 and 2019.** Many of the drugs approved in recent years are high-priced specialty drugs for relatively small numbers of potential patients. By contrast, the top-selling drugs of the 1990s were lower-cost drugs with large patient populations. R&D Spending R&D spending in the pharmaceutical industry covers a variety of activities, including the following: Invention, or research and discovery of new drugs; Development, or clinical testing, preparation and submission of applications for FDA approval, and design of production processes for new drugs; Incremental innovation, including the development of new dosages and delivery mechanisms for existing drugs and the testing of those drugs for additional indications; Product differentiation, or the clinical testing of a new drug against an existing rival drug to show that the new drug is superior; and Safety monitoring, or clinical trials (conducted after a drug has reached the market) that the FDA may require to detect side effects that may not have been observed in shorter trials when the drug was in development. In real terms**, private investment in drug R&D among member firms of the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA), an industry trade association, was about $83 billion in 2019, up from about $5 billion in 1980 and $38 billion in 2000**.1 Although those spending totals do not include spending by many smaller drug companies that do not belong to PhRMA, the trend is broadly representative of R&D spending by the industry as a whole.2 A survey of all U.S. pharmaceutical R&D spending (including that of smaller firms) by the National Science Foundation (NSF) reveals similar trends.3 Although total R&D spending by all drug companies has trended upward, small and large firms generally focus on different R&D activities. **Small companies not in PhRMA devote a greater share of their research to developing and testing new drugs,** many of which are ultimately sold to larger firms (see Box 1). By contrast, a greater portion of the R&D spending of larger drug companies (including those in PhRMA) is devoted to conducting clinical trials, developing incremental “line extension” improvements (such as new dosages or delivery systems, or new combinations of two or more existing drugs), and conducting postapproval testing for safety-monitoring or marketing purposes.

#### The aff crushes innovation in the pharma sector---incentivizes them to focus on non-important issues.

Glassman 21 [Amanda; 5/6/21; Executive vice president and a senior fellow at the Center for Global Development, a nonpartisan, nonprofit think tank in Washington and London; “*Big Pharma Is Not the Tobacco Industry*,” Barron, <https://www.barrons.com/articles/big-pharma-is-not-the-tobacco-industry-51620315693>] Justin

But here is the crux of the problem: The pharmaceutical industry is not the tobacco industry. They are not merchants of death. The companies are amoral and exist to make money, but their business is not fundamentally immoral. Big Pharma (mostly) develops and sells products that people need to survive and thrive. Their products improve health and welfare. Fights over access to medicines are possible because medicines exist in the first place—medicines that were usually developed by Big Pharma. And yes, the pharmaceutical industry benefits from public subsidy and publicly financed foundational research. But the companies also put their own capital at risk to develop new products, some of which offer enormous public benefits. In fact, several of them did just that in the pandemic: invested their own money to develop patented manufacturing technologies in record time. Those technologies are literally saving the world right now. Public funding supported research and development, but companies also brought their own proprietary ingenuity and private investments to bear toward solving the world’s singular, collective challenge. Their reward should be astronomical given the insane scale of the health and economic benefits these highly efficacious vaccines produce every day. Market incentives sent a clear signal that further needed innovation—greater efficacy, single doses, more-rapid manufacturing, updated formulations, fast boosters, and others—would be richly rewarded. Market incentives could also have been used to lubricate supply lines and buy vaccines on behalf of the entire world; with enough money, incredible things can happen. But activist lobbying to waive patents—a move the Biden administration endorsed yesterday—sends exactly the opposite signal. It says that the most important, valuable innovations will be penalized, not rewarded. It tells innovators, don’t bother attacking the most important global problems; instead, throw your investment dollars at the next treatment for erectile disfunction, which will surely earn you a steady return with far less agita. It is worth going back to first principles. What problem are we trying to solve? We have highly efficacious vaccines that we would like to get out to the entire world as quickly as possible to minimize, preventable disease and deaths address atrocious inequities, and enable the reopening of society, trade, and commerce. Hundreds of millions of people have been plunged into poverty over the past year; in the developing world, the pandemic is just getting started. What is the quickest way to get this done? Vaccine manufacturing is not just a recipe; if you attack and undermine the companies that have the know-how, do you really expect they’ll be eager to help you set up manufacturing elsewhere? Is the plan to march into Pfizer and force its staff to redeploy to Costa Rica to build a new factory? Do the U.S. administration or activists care that this decision could take years to negotiate at the World Trade Organization, and will likely be litigated for years thereafter? Does it make sense to eliminate the incentive for private companies to invest in vaccine R&D or in the response to the next health emergency? And if the patent waiver is only temporary and building a factory takes months or years, will anyone bother to do so, even if they could? No, none of it makes sense. Worse still, we could solve the policy problem more easily by harnessing market incentives for the global good by ponying up cash to vaccinate the entire world. No confiscation necessary.

#### Pharma Innovation prevents Extinction – checks new diseases.

Engelhardt 8, H. Tristram. Innovation and the pharmaceutical industry: critical reflections on the virtues of profit. M & M Scrivener Press, 2008 (doctorate in philosophy (University of Texas at Austin), M.D. (Tulane University), professor of philosophy (Rice University), and professor emeritus at Baylor College of Medicine)

Many are suspicious of, or indeed jealous of, the good fortune of others. Even when profit is gained in the market without fraud and with the consent of all buying and selling goods and services, there is a sense on the part of some that something is wrong if considerable profit is secured. There is even a sense that good fortune in the market, especially if it is very good fortune, is unfair. One might think of such rhetorically disparaging terms as "wind-fall profits". There is also a suspicion of the pursuit of profit because it is often embraced not just because of the material benefits it sought, but because of the hierarchical satisfaction of being more affluent than others. The pursuit of profit in the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries is tor many in particular morally dubious because it is acquired from those who have the bad fortune to be diseased or disabled. Although the suspicion of profit is not well-founded, this suspicion is a major moral and public-policy challenge. Profit in the market for the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries is to be celebrated. This is the case, in that if one is of the view (1) that the presence of additional resources for research and development spurs innovation in the development of pharmaceuticals and med-ical devices (i.e., if one is of the view that the allure of **profit is one of the most effective ways not only to acquire resources but productively to direct human energies** in their use), (2) that given the limits of altruism and of the willingness of persons to be taxed, the possibility of profits is necessary to secure such resources, (3) that the allure of profits also tends to enhance the creative use of available resources in the pursuit of phar-maceutical and medical-device innovation, and (4) if one judges it to be the case that such innovation is both necessary to maintain the human species in an ever-changing and always dangerous environment in which new microbial and other threats may at any time emerge to threaten human well-being, if not survival (i.e., that such innovation is necessary to prevent increases in morbidity and mortality risks), as well as (5) in order generally to decrease morbidity and mortality risks in the future, it then follows (6) that one should be concerned regarding any policies that decrease the amount of resources and energies available to encourage such innovation. One should indeed be of the view that the possibilities for profit, all things being equal, should be highest in the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries. Yet, there is a suspicion regarding the pursuit of profit in medicine and especially in the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries.

#### Pharma spills-over – has cascading global impacts that are necessary for human survival.

NAS 8 National Academy of Sciences 12-3-2008 “The Role of the Life Sciences in Transforming America's Future Summary of a Workshop” //Re-cut by Elmer

Fostering Industries to Counter Global Problems The life sciences have applications in areas that range far beyond human health. Life-science based approaches could **contribute to advances in** many industries, from energy production and pollution remediation, to clean manufacturing and the production of new biologically inspired materials. In fact, biological systems could provide the basis for new products, services and industries that we cannot yet imagine. Microbes are already producing biofuels and could, through further research, provide a major component of future energy supplies. Marine and terrestrial organisms extract carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, which suggests that biological systems could be used to help manage climate change. Study of the complex systems encountered in biology is decade, it is really just the beginning.” Advances in the underlying science of plant and animal breeding have been just as dramatic as the advances in genetic can put down a band of fertilizer, come back six months later, and plant seeds exactly on that row, reducing the need for fertilizer, pesticides, and other agricultural inputs. Fraley said that the global agricultural system needs to adopt the goal of doubling the current yield of **crops while reducing key inputs like pesticides, fertilizers, and water** by one third. “It is more important than putting a man on the moon,” he said. Doubling agricultural yields would “change the world.” Another billion people will join the middle class over the next decade just in India and China as economies continue to grow. And all people need and deserve secure access to food supplies. Continued progress will require both basic and applied research, The evolution of life “put earth under new management,” Collins said. Understanding the future state of the planet will require understanding the biological systems that have shaped the planet. Many of these biological systems are found in the oceans, which cover 70 percent of the earth’s surface and have a crucial impact on weather, climate, and the composition of the atmosphere. In the past decade, new tools have become available to explore the microbial processes that drive the **chemistry of the oceans**, observed David Kingsbury, Chief Program Officer for Science at the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. These technologies have revealed that a large proportion of the planet’s genetic diversity resides in the oceans. In addition, many organisms in the oceans readily exchange genes, creating evolutionary forces that can have global effects. The oceans are currently under great stress, Kingsbury pointed out. Nutrient runoff from agriculture is helping to create huge and expanding “dead zones” where oxygen levels are too low to sustain life. Toxic algal blooms are occurring with higher frequency in areas where they have not been seen in the past. Exploitation of ocean resources is disrupting ecological balances that have formed over many millions of years. Human-induced changes in the chemistry of the atmosphere are changing the chemistry of the oceans, with potentially catastrophic consequences. “If we are not careful, we are not going to have a sustainable planet to live on,” said Kingsbury. Only by understanding the basic biological processes at work in the oceans can humans live sustainably on earth.